



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,650	07/16/2003	Thomas J. Hayes	47097-01079USC1	1477
28763	7590	03/13/2006	EXAMINER	
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP 1700 K STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20006			CASTELLANO, STEPHEN J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

3727

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/620,650

Applicant(s)

HAYES ET AL.

Examiner

Stephen J. Castellano

Art Unit

3727

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 51-118 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 74-97 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 51-73 and 98-118 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9-8-03 and 7-16-03
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 3727

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 98-118 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Goins et al. ('453)(Goins).

Goins discloses a food packaging cover 10, the cover is capable of being used as a base if turned upside-down and used like a bowl. Goins discloses a rib structure. The rib structure includes first rib units, each first unit includes a first outward rib (panel 28 and two one-half portions of inward ribs adjacent to panel 28 including gussets 42) and a first inward rib (inward rib 26 adjacent to the panel 28). The rib structure includes second rib units, each second rib unit includes a second inward rib (next inwardly directed portion adjacent to the first inward rib to the side away from the first outward rib). The second inward projecting rib extends inwardly a distance less than the first inward projecting rib extends.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 51-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goins et al. ('453)(Goins) in view of Lucas, Jr. et al. (Lucas).

Goins discloses a food packaging cover 10, the cover is capable of being used as a base if turned upside-down and used like a bowl. Goins discloses a rib structure. The rib structure

Art Unit: 3727

includes first rib units, each first unit extends from the midpoint of rib 26 to the midpoint of an adjacent rib 26 but is not touching another first rib unit such that the first rib units are spaced circumferentially and includes one rib 28, two inwardly extending ribs immediately adjacent to rib 28, two projections 36 and one projection. The rib structure also includes second rib units, each second unit consisting of the inwardly projecting rib adjacent to but not part of the first rib unit and touching a rib 28, each second unit has a gusset 42. The first rib units include a first outwardly projecting rib (the entire first rib unit) and a first inwardly projecting rib (the inwardly projecting portion touching rib 28 within a first rib unit). formed within the first outwardly projecting rib. The second rib units consist of only the inwardly projecting rib. The second inwardly projecting rib having the exact same vertical height as the first inwardly projecting rib. Goins discloses the invention except for the second inward projecting rib being shorter than the first inward projecting rib. Lucas teaches a food cover that is similar to Goins and is capable of being used as a base if turned upside-down and used like a bowl. Lucas teaches inwardly projecting ribs 54a of shorter vertical height than the vertical height of the inwardly projecting ribs 54. It would have been obvious to modify the second inward projecting ribs of Goins to be shorter than the first inward projecting ribs for the reasons advanced by Lucas as stated in col. 5, lines 24-31 to improve stability.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re*

Art Unit: 3727

Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).


Claims 51-118 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,619,501 to Hayes et al. (Hayes). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all of the claims structure is stated in claims 1-8 of the ('501) patent. This situation is similar to *In re Goodman*. The claims of the ('501) patent have more elements than what the claims of the present invention have and therefore, a straight type double patenting rejection is not proper. It would have been obvious to modify the invention by eliminating unnecessary elements if their function is not desired.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen J. Castellano whose telephone number is 571-272-4535. The examiner can normally be reached on Tu-F 6:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Newhouse can be reached on 571-272-4544. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3727

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Stephen J. Castellano
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3727

sjc